RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY

Case No.: 5:19-cv-00163-FMO-SP

Plaintiffs Amanda Hill and Gayle Hyde, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, submit this response in opposition to the Motion to Stay (ECF No. 15 (the "Motion")) filed by Defendant Quicken Loans, Inc.

ARGUMENT

On March 18, 2019, Defendant moved to stay this action pursuant to the so-called "first-filed" doctrine, arguing it is "duplicative of and subsumed within two earlier-filed class actions pending in the Middle District of Florida and the District of Minnesota." (ECF No. 15-1 at 5 (citing *Hackett v. Quicken Loans, Inc.*, No. 6:18-cv-02151 (M.D. Fla.); *Hyde v. Quicken Loans, Inc.*, No. 0:19-cv-00196 (D. Minn.).)

Although the Motion was without merit to begin with, recent events have rendered it completely moot. On April 1, 2019, the *Hyde* action was voluntarily dismissed by the plaintiff pursuant to Rule 41(a) (see Exhibit A hereto (notice of voluntary dismissal filed in *Hyde*)), and, later that same day, the plaintiff in the *Hackett* action filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint pursuant to Rule 15(a)(2) (prior to the court-imposed amendment deadline) for the stated purpose of removing his class-wide allegations and thereafter pursuing his claims on a purely individual basis. (See Exhibit B hereto (motion for leave to amend filed in *Hackett*)).

There is thus is no longer any colorable basis to request a stay of this action on the grounds that, as articulated in the Motion, "the *Hackett* and *Hyde* cases purport to represent nationwide classes that would include Plaintiff as a class member if those cases were somehow certified[.]" (ECF No. 15-1 at 5 (articulating basis for requested stay pending resolution of *Hyde* and *Hackett*)). Rather, because the *Hyde* action was dismissed and the plaintiff in the *Hackett* action no longer "purport[s] to represent [a] nationwide class[]," *id.*, the Motion is moot and this litigation should proceed in the ordinary course.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Motion should be denied as moot.

Dated: April 1, 2019 Respectfully submitted, 1 HEDIN HALL LLP 2 By: /s/ Frank S. Hedin 3 Frank S. Hedin 4 Frank S. Hedin (SBN 291289) fhedin@hedinhall.com 1395 Brickell Ave, Suite 900 Miami, Florida 33131 Telephone: (305) 357-2107 5 6 Facsimile: (305) 200-8801 7 **HEDIN HALL LLP** David W. Hall (SBN 274921) 8 dhall@hedinhall.com Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400 San Francisco, California 94111 9 Telephone: (415) 766-3534 10 Facsimile: (415) 402-0058 11 KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN 249203) 12 ak@kazlg.com Jason A. Ibey, Esq. (SBN 284607) KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC 245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT DI COSTA MESA, CA 92626 13 jason@kazlg.com 245 Fischer Avenue, Suite D1 14 Costa Mesa, California 92626 Telephone: (800) 400-6808 Facsimile: (800) 520-5523 15 16 STEIN SAKS PLLC 17 Yaakov Saks* ysaks@steinsakslegal.com 285 Passaic Street 18 Hackensack, NJ 07601
Telephone: 201-282-6500
Facsimile: 201-282-6501
* Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming 19 20 Counsel for Plaintiffs and Putative Classes 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY Case No.: 5:19-cv-00163-FMO-SP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Frank S. Hedin, electronically submitted the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Central District of California, using the electronic case filing system. I hereby certify that I have provided copies to all counsel of record electronically or by another manner authorized by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2).

Dated: April 1, 2019 Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Frank S. Hedin Frank S. Hedin

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY Case No.: 5:19-cv-00163-FMO-SP

PAGE 3 OF 3